

specimen of *Cicindela venosa*, Koll.,¹ which was collected in the evening after dusk, the only species found in this situation were *C. angulata*, Fabr.,² *C. sumatrensis*, Herbst,³ and *C. agnata*, Flt.,⁴ and it is perhaps noteworthy that every specimen caught was of a variety with dulled markings, whereas in the longer series of the last named species collected near Balyghai most were of the brightly marked variety. Whether or not these colour differences really depend on the environment I cannot definitely say; but most of the specimens from Balyghai were certainly collected on cleaner, dryer sand of a pale colour, and a beetle of this species collected on clean yellow sand on the bank of a stream near Chakardharpur in Chota Nagpur was of the most brilliant type; whilst two specimens of *C. sumatrensis* collected at the same place were both more brightly marked than those from the muddier sand by the river at Cuttack. Above the bank of the river at Cuttack there was an open grassy area on which the floods had deposited a thin layer of slimy mud. Although continuous with the more sandy river-bank it was inhabited only by two species of tiger-beetles neither of which were to be found there. These species were *C. cognata*, Wdm., and *C. minuta*, Oliv. The latter being a small dark brown species was very inconspicuous on the mud, and evidently chooses mud-banks as its home, for on that part of the bank of the stream near Chakardharpur where the sand on which *C. agnata* and *C. sumatrensis* occurred was replaced by mud, these latter species were replaced by *C. minuta*. *C. cognata*, on the other hand, although dark coloured and not very large, was rendered conspicuous on the mud by its bluish colour, and I suspect that it normally inhabits grassy land such as this had been and would soon be again; for on such land its colour would blend excellently with its surroundings.

In conclusion I have to thank Dr. Horn for the identification of the beetles collected. Dr. Horn informs me that the tiger-beetles of Orissa are as yet but imperfectly known and suggests that all the species I collected there should be mentioned in this note. To those already referred to I have only to add *Collyris distincta*, Chd. var., on the label attached to which Dr. Horn inserts the note "palp. lab. ex parte rufis, ect." This form was abundant in a clump of trees close to the dak bungalow at Balyghai on the shores of the Sur Lake.

F. H. GRAVELY.

Schizodactylus monstrosus AS BAIT FOR BIRDS.—Perhaps the bait most commonly used by Indian bird-catchers and falconers for snaring insect-loving birds like the Roller, etc. is the mole-

¹ See Annandale, loc. cit., p. 13.

² See Annandale, loc. cit., p. 15.

³ See Annandale, loc. cit., p. 14, where it is noticed that this species replaces *C. bitramosa* at a short distance from the sea at Trivandrum just as *C. cancellata*, *C. albina* and *C. agnata* do at Balyghai.

⁴ See Annandale, loc. cit., p. 13.

cricket (*Gryllotalpa*) called in the Punjab *ghū, ān*. Tethered by a thread to a peg it moves to and fro and by its restlessness attracts notice. It should however be kept in the shade as if exposed for many minutes to a fierce sun it will perish. Perhaps this is the reason that some bird-catchers prefer the great grasshopper with curved wings (*Schizodactylus monstrosus*) called *Mirag* in the Chach-Hazara district and *labāna*¹ in the Punjab. For some of the smaller insect-eating birds it must be too large and terrifying, but it is said to be hardy and to stand the sun far better than its rival for favour, the mole-cricket.

D. C. PHILLOTT.

FISH.

Macrones menoda VAR. *trachacanthus* (Cuv. et Val.)—The specimen described below was received in the Museum for identification from Mr. Kinnear of the Bombay Natural History Society nearly a year ago, and as it showed some very interesting features and was a proof against Day's charge of misprint and wrong description concerning Cuvier and Valenciennes' species *B. trachacanthus*, it was thought desirable to wait for more specimens; but this short note need not be kept back any longer.

In all essential particulars, including the proportionate length of the barbels and the remarkable filamentous prolongation of the lower lobe of the caudal fin, this fish resembles the species which Cuvier and Valenciennes described in 1839 as a new species from Bengal in their *Histoire Naturelle des Poissons*, vol. xiv, p. 419, under the name *Bagrus trachacanthus*. The character of the lower lobe of the caudal fin was thus distinctly stated on page 420: "Le lobe inférieur de la caudale dépasse l'autre de près d'un tiers et se termine en filet."

Dr. Gunther in 1864 included this species of Cuvier's in a footnote under the genus *Macrones* as one of the doubtful species (*Brit. Mus. Cat. Fish*, vol. v, p. 75), but it was left to Day definitely to assert that Cuvier's description was a misprint and a wrong one, especially with regard to the filamentous prolongation of the lower caudal lobe. The specimen under examination refutes the charge and is a proof positive that Cuvier's description was not a misprint.

In 1822 Hamilton (Buchanan) published the plates illustrating his descriptions of the fishes of the Ganges. Below fig. 72 of Plate i of these illustrations the name "*Mugil corsula*" occurs in print. Edward Blyth in 1858, in supplying an additional description of the fish represented by this published figure of Hamilton (Buchanan) points out that under the original drawing of this fish of which fig. 72 is a print, the name "*Pimolodus menoda*" occurs in Hamilton (Buchanan's) own handwriting. Moreover fig. 97 of Plate ix of the same set of illustrations is correctly named "*Mugil corsula*," which is described by Hamilton (Buchanan) in his *Gangetic Fishes* under the same name (p. 221, *Gangetic Fishes Text*, and

¹ In Chach *labāna* is the name for small bird.